



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/428,647 10/28/99 SCHULE

R SCH-1700

023599 HM12/0924
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELAND & BRANIGAN, P.C.
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.
SUITE 1400
ARLINGTON VA 22201

EXAMINER

MURPHY, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED:

09/24/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	09/428,647	SCHULE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Joseph F Murphy	1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-9 in Paper No. 7, 7/11/2001 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that an examination of all the groups imposes no serious burden on the PTO. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are distinct as noted in the last Office Action, as shown by the distinctness described therein. Applicant's attention is directed to MPEP 806.05. Furthermore, contrary to applicants' assertion that any search of the prior art in regard to group I will reveal whether any prior art exists as to the other Groups, a search is directed to references which would render the invention obvious, as well as references directed to anticipation of the invention, and therefore requires a search of relevant literature in many different areas of subject matter. Claims 10-12 are withdrawn from consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Specification

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference. The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re*

Hawkins, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973). On page 1, lines 1-3 of the instant Specification, Applicant's attempt to incorporate by reference the subject matter of a cited scientific paper (Madgwick et al. (1996) which sets forth the sequence of the SLIM3 protein. However, this document encompasses essential matter, and the sequence of the SLIM3 polypeptide is essential for the practice of a method which makes use of the SLIM3 polypeptide. Therefore, the above cited document encompasses essential subject matter, which cannot be incorporated by reference to publications (See MPEP 608.01(p)). Clearly, the amino acid sequence of the SLIM3 polypeptide is necessary to practice the claimed method.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of identifying agents that regulate the transcriptional activating domain of human AR and human SLIM3, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of identifying agents that regulate the transcriptional activating domain of human AR and biologically active fragments of human SLIM3. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1-9 are overly broad in the recitation of "biologically active derivatives" since insufficient guidance is provided as to which of the myriad of polypeptide species encompassed by the claim will retain the characteristics of SLIM3. The specification (page 11, line 29 to page 12 line 6) defines SLIM3 derivatives are determined in that the function according to the examples of the SLIM3 that is described in the literature is compared to the modification. Applicants disclose that fragments of the polypeptide may be splice variants, and fragments resulting from in vitro protease activity, without disclosing any actual or prophetic examples on expected performance parameters of any of the possible muteins of SLIM3. However, it is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. For example, Mikayama et al. (1993) teaches that the human glycosylation-inhibiting factor (GIF) protein differs from human migration inhibitory factor (MIF) by a single amino acid residue (page 10056, Figure 1). Yet, despite the fact that these proteins are 90% identical at the amino acid level, GIF is unable to carry out the function of MIF, and MIF does not exhibit GIF bioactivity (page 10059, second column, third paragraph). It is also known in the art that a single amino acid change in a protein's sequence can drastically affect the structure of the protein and the architecture of an entire cell. Voet et al. (1990) teaches that a single Glu to Val substitution in the beta subunit of hemoglobin causes the hemoglobin molecules to associate with one another in such a manner that, in homozygous individuals, erythrocytes are altered from their normal discoid shape and assume the sickle shape characteristic of sickle-cell anemia, causing hemolytic anemia and blood flow blockages (pages 126-128, section 6-3A and page 23-, column 2, first paragraph).

There is no guidance provided in the instant specification as to how one of skill in the art would generate a SLIM3 polypeptide other than those exemplified in the specification. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. The factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is “undue” include, but are not limited to: (1) the breadth of the claims; (2) the nature of the invention; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the level of one of ordinary skill; (5) the level of predictability in the art; (6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (7) the existence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Since the predictability in the art is low with regards to knowing which amino acids are necessary to maintain the functional properties of a peptide and the specification offers insufficient explanation, guidance or working examples as to which amino acids are required to maintain the biological activity of the claimed peptide, it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite in the recitation of the term "biologically active". The term "biologically active" is not defined by the claim, but give no definition of what this activity is. Various biological activities can be attributed to a peptide. For example, "activity" could constitute transportation throughout a cell, alteration of tertiary structure due to changes in pH, ligand binding, or modulation of second messenger effect, etc. 'Activity' could also be referring to the ability of the fragment to stimulate antibody production.

Claims 1-9 are vague and indefinite in the recitation of the terms "AR", "SLIM3" and "ERB". There is no definition within the claim to define the protein to which these acronyms refer. Thus, the metes and bounds of these claims cannot be determined

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,789,170 (Chang et al.). U.S. Patent No. 5,789,170 has a priority date of May 23, 1996.

U.S. Patent no. 5, 789, 170 discloses the cloning and expression of a co-activator of human androgen receptor, ARA70 (column 2, lines 6-16). Based on the limitation "biologically active derivative" in claim 1, ARA 70 can be considered a biologically active derivative of SLIM3. U.S. Patent No. 5, 789,170 also discloses methods of screening for ligands which regulate transcriptional activity of androgen receptor in the presence of ARA70, (column 6, lines 3-15) in the yeast two-hybrid system, using AR-GAL4 binding domain fusion constructs (column 4, lines 23-35). Thus claims 1-9 are anticipated.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph F. Murphy whose telephone number is 703-305-7245. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 703-308-6564. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
September 17, 2001

Prema Mertz
PREMA MERTZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER